



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/039,932	11/01/2001	Mark S. Buehler	263556US	9943
22850	7590	06/27/2008	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				BROWN, RUEBEN M
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2623				
NOTIFICATION DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
06/27/2008			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/039,932	BUEHLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	REUBEN M. BROWN	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,6-10,12,13,15,17,19-23,25,27-31,33-42 and 45-49 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,6-10,12,13,15,17,19-23,25,27-31,33-42 and 45-49 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant argues on page 15 that even though Da Palma teaches management bean technology, that the reference does not teach all of the elements of the presently claimed subject matter. However, it is pointed out that Da Palma (col. 2-col. 4) discloses that the Java Bean technology is applicable for controlling managed resources, which reads on the plurality of device types of Comstock. While Da Palma does mention that the MBean may be related to Java class(es) the reference does not discuss this feature in any detail.

Nevertheless, Timbol provides a more descriptive teaching on the purpose and functionality of the class structure in the Java technology. In particular, Timbol is directed to a technique that enables a user to create a plurality of Java Beans using a wizard-based graphical user interface that provides the user a variety of options for selecting/programming the attributes and properties of the instant Java Bean, see Abstract; col. 4, lines 5-40; Fig. 2C & Fig. 3. Timbol goes on to disclose that one of the first parameters chosen by the user with respect to the Java Bean, is the class to which the instant Java Bean will belong. Timbol teaches that by definition, all Java Beans must be associated with a particular class (col. 10 lines 25-65) wherein a Java class is a tool used in the Java programming language to define a set of attributes or services that characterize any member (object) of the class.

Therefore, the combination of Da Palma & Timbol necessarily provides for organizing the Management Beans of Da Palma into particular class structure, each one with different attributes to control the any variety of managed resources, e.g., the disparate devices discloses in Comstock.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 6-10, 12-13, 15, 17, 19-21, 23, 25, 27 & 35, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Comstock, (U.S. Pat # 6,704,769), in view of Da Palma, (U.S. Pat # 6,874,020), Amini (U.S. Pat # 6,698,021) and Timbol, (U.S. Pat # 6,237,135).

Considering claim 1, the claimed system for managing video teleconferencing devices configured to exchange audio/video data, the system comprising:

‘a management adapter accessible to a user interface, the management adapter having a list that identifies the plural video teleconferencing devices configured to exchange audio/video data’, reads on the policy manager 136 in Comstock, (col. 5, lines 50-62; col. 9, lines 5-15). The policy manager 136 necessarily maintains a list of devices in the system, in order to “coordinate connection establishment and termination”. For instance, Comstock teaches that the display terminal may display the plural roles played by the different terminals in the system, which reads on a list, (col. 6, lines 33-40). Comstock teaches that the policy manager 36, which may be located in the MCU 20 (col. 5, lines 55-61; col. 10, lines 9-15), which is the case when the MCU 20 is providing centralized control of the video teleconference, generally between three or more terminals.

*‘a device access layer interfaced between the management adapter and the video teleconferencing devices, the device access layer representing the plural video teleconferencing as **Management Beans** to support management of the video teleconferencing through the management adapters during set-up or conduct of an active video teleconference’*, even though the policy manager 136 interfaces with video teleconferencing devices, the reference does not explicitly discuss a device layer as such. However, Da Palma discloses the use of the Java Management Extension (JMX) suite that supports the deployment of the management bean structure that enables the various devices in the system to be referred to as objects, i.e., MBean (Abstract; col. 4, lines 29-52; col. 6, lines 14-61; col. 8, lines 14-34). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the disclosure of Comstock to include the use of MBean construct as a device access layer, for the advantage of a

known algorithm for registering the devices as objects for more efficient management of the devices, see col. 2, lines 1-19; col. 4, lines 9-52.

*As for the additionally claimed feature of each Management Beans being configured to perform a **protocol conversion between a native protocol** of one of the plural video teleconferencing devices and a management interface protocol used by the management adapter', Da Palma teaches that the JMX includes a protocol adapter that can communicate with a data source using a particular protocol, such as HTML, or SNMP, see col. 3, lines 45-67 thru col. 4, lines 1-8. However, Da Palma does not explicitly show that the data source being adapted to, or the resource being managed is a video teleconferencing device. Nevertheless, Amini provides a teaching of Java programming language used to control the capturing, processing and display of video by video conferencing type devices, such as a camera 312 and workstation 322, see Abstract; col. 7, lines 22-60; col. 8, lines 1-50. In particular, Amini teaches that a CameraControl application 520, ViewControl application 620 and ArchiveViewer application 630 may be embodied in a Java programming interface. These Java programs control the associated camera 312, workstation 322 for displaying and storage/retrieval of captured images. Therefore, the combination of Comstock, Da Palma & Amini meets the claimed subject matter. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the combination of Comstock & Da Palma with the feature of an interface that converts between video conferencing devices and the management layer, for the benefit of providing a user friendly GUI that allows the manager direct control of the instant device, as taught by Amini.*

As for the further claimed feature of, '*wherein each of the video teleconferencing devices have a corresponding type, the device access layer associating the Management Bean in classes, with each of the classes being associated with a respective type of the plural video teleconferencing devices*', Comstock clearly recognizes the different types of devices on at least two parameters. First of all, Comstock supports the use of H.323, which by definition, includes the recognition of different classes of endpoint devices, i.e., MCU 20, gateway 30 and terminal 100. Additionally, the system supports both H.323 terminals 90 (which communicate using IP, Internet 80) and the H.320 terminals 70 (which communicate using a PSTN 60).

Furthermore, the disclosure of MBean structures featured in Da Palma discloses that an MBean may be constructed based on a Java class, see col. 2, lines 1-15; col. 8, lines 14-34; col. 9, lines 48-58. However, Da Palma does not discuss the details of the Java class structure technology. Nevertheless, Timbol which is in the same field of endeavor of object oriented programming, provides a disclosure of wizard based graphical user interface used to create Java Beans (which corresponds with the Management Beans of Da Palma). In Timbol, all Java Beans require a particular class, since the user must choose class when the Java Bean is created, see Fig. 2C; Fig. 3; col. 10, lines 11-67; col. 19. A Java class is a software construct that defines instance variables and methods that serve as a template for a plurality of objects, Timbol, col. 2, lines 31-67.

Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to operate the combination of Comstock & Da Palma, by associating all Java/Management Bean into particular classes, for the purpose of providing packaged programming modules that interface with a common managed resource, as taught by Timbol, see col. 4, lines 5-40; col. 9, lines 35-67 thru col. 10, lines 1-10.

Considering claims 6-10, the H.323 protocol supported by Comstock provides for each of the endpoint, MCU, gatekeeper and gateway types, and a common interface, see col. 3, lines 50-67 & col. 4, lines 29-67; Figs. 1-2. The claimed subject matter is met by the above disclosure of Comstock, and the teachings of Da Palma & Timbol, as discussed in claim 1.

Considering claim 12, since the video teleconferencing devices in Comstock have access to a video network, (e.g., in order to send/receive video), the combination of Comstock & Da Palma meets the claim.

Considering claims 13 & 19, the claimed '*one or more of the device types, each of the plural device types having a common interface*', reads on whichever class of Management Bean the device is associated with, and interacting with the system using the H.320 protocol and another device interacting with the system using the H.323 protocol, see Comstock col. 3, lines 1-50. Again, the claimed Management Bean is met by the disclosure of Da Palma, col. 6, lines 14-61; col. 9, lines 48-58. as discussed in claim 1.

Considering claim 15, the claimed steps of a method for communicating with a first and second teleconferencing configured to exchange audio/video data and having corresponding first & second formats, that correspond with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claim 1, is likewise treated.

'dividing the teleconferencing devices into types', reads on the disclosure in Comstock of the types of devices, such as MCU 20, gateway 30 or end terminal 70,90, see col. 3, lines 35-61.

'establishing Management Beans to support management of the first and second teleconferencing devices', reads on the attributes and specifications that inherently correspond with the different type of devices, previously listed and the disclosure of Da Palma that the Management Beans are used to control/interface with managed resources, col. 4, lines 1-65.

'interfacing with a management platform though a management interface to identify the teleconferencing devices', also reads on the operation of the rack 30 which identifies the types of devices listed above and interfaces with them based on their attributes, as discussed in Comstock and the combination of Da Palma, see col. 8, lines 14-44.

The additionally claimed features of *'associating the first and second video teleconferencing devices with first and second Management Beans, such that the Management Beans are associated in classes, with each of the classes being associated with a type of video teleconference device'*, corresponds with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claims 1, and is likewise treated. *'translating communication to the first and second video*

teleconferencing devices from the management interface format with the first & second communication formats which are native protocols of the instant first and second video teleconferencing devices', corresponds with the teaching of Da Palma & Amini, as discussed above which discloses Management Beans used to identify and interact with devices as objects, using a protocol adapter technique, col. 2, lines 1-20; col. 3, lines 45-67 thru col. 4, lines 1-45; col. 5, lines 1-11; col. 6, lines 26-61 & col. 8, lines 40-60 & col. 9, lines 49-67.

'sending audio/video data from of the first and second video teleconferencing devices to another of the first and second video teleconferencing devices' reads on the operation of Comstock.

Considering claim 17, Da Palma teaches the use of SNMP technology, col. 9, lines 55-62.

Considering claims 20 & 25, the claimed system and method for interfacing an SNMP management application with plural video teleconferencing devices having different native interface protocols, corresponds with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claim 1, is likewise treated.

'comprising representing the plural video teleconferencing devices as Management Beans stored on a server, such that the Management Beans support management of video

teleconferencing devices', corresponds with the discussion in Da Palma of representing objects in a system as such, see col. 4, lines 10-60.

'providing SNMP instructions for a video teleconferencing device to an SNMP adapter'; 'communicating SNMP management instruction using the SNMP adapter as a management Bean client in communication with the server'; 'communicating the SNMP management instruction from server through the Management Bean representing the video teleconferencing device...' , also corresponds with the teaching in Da Palma that the system may operate using SNMP technology, using a protocol adapter to/from SNMP format, col. 3, lines 50-67; col. 4, lines 1-5; col. 9, lines 50-67.

'sending audio/video data from one of the plural video teleconferencing devices to another video teleconferencing devices', is met by the operation of Comstock.

Considering claim 21, Comstock teaches that the H.323 terminals operate over IP networks, col. 4, lines 35-50, whereas Da Palma teaches that system also does protocol conversion for HTML, i.e. IP format.

Considering claims 23, '*standardized attributes*' reads on the attributes inherent associated with devices in Comstock, MCU 20, gateway 30, terminals 70, 90.

Considering claim 27, the claimed method for managing a video network having plural video teleconferencing devices, comprising steps that correspond with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claims 1 & 15, are likewise treated.

Considering claims 35, in Da Palma, the devices may receive management instructions in formats other than SNMP.

4. Claims 22, 28-31 & 33-34, 36-42 & 45-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Comstock, Da Palma, Amini & Timbol, further in view of Ismael, (U.S. Pat # 6,061,721).

Considering claims 22, 28-31, 33-34, 36-42 & 45-49, Da Palma and Timbol are directed to using Java Bean technology to manage devices, remotely from a server, but does not discuss the use of MIB technique. Nevertheless Ismael, which is in the same field of object oriented programming discloses that an SNMP managed object adapter server can be arranged to use a specially defined SNMP management information base (MIB) to enable the SNMP manager to perform management operations on a network management system, col. 5, lines 17-55; col. 7, lines 45-58; col. 8, lines 17-48; col. 9, lines 10-50. It would have been obvious for one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the combination of Comstock & Da Palma with the feature of MIB structure, at least for the known advantage of the specially defined programming module that enables the server to manage one or more resources, as taught by Ismael, which would be common across the plurality of devices that utilize the MIB.

Regarding claims 28 & 29, Timbol provides for listing attributes and/or properties of the Java Bean, from which the user makes a selection, see Fig. 3, 5, 9 & 11; col. 10, lines 21-67; col. 11; col. 12; col. 13.

Regarding claims 31, Da Palma teaches that the system provides conversion between SNMP technology, col. 4, lines 1-10 & col. 9, lines 49-62.

Regarding claims 33-34, 37, 39, 46 & 49, Timbol discloses read-only variables for a Java Bean and restricting some of the variables from being modified by certain users, see col. 14, lines 4-14.

Regarding claims 36 & 45, the claimed system for managing a video network, corresponds with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claims 20, 25 & 27, and is likewise treated.

Regarding claim 38, the claimed tiered structure reads on Fig. 3, Timbol, col. 10; col. 13, use of the drop down menu and the hierarchical nature of Java programming.

Regarding claim 47, the claimed '*translator table*' reads on Timbol, Fig. 4; col. 11, lines 45-67.

Regarding claim 48, Official Notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, the use of HP Openview as a conferencing application was known in the art. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the disclosure of Comstock with known technology of Openview, at least in order to utilize a standard conferencing method.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's claims.

- A) Microsoft Press, Computer Dictionary Definition of a class structure in object oriented programming.
- B) Messer Detailed teaching of using Java programming language to control a set-top device and/or TV, see col. 4, lines 55-67 thru col. 5, lines 1-20.
- C) Humpleman Directed to a home network system, (which can be used in video conferencing), and teaches that all devices can be programmed in Java.
- D) Wigger Discloses creating Java Beans according to class structure, see col. 1; col. 3, lines 51-67; col. 6, lines 58-67; col. 7, lines 1-10.

E) Fernandez Teaches a controller/processor 34 at a user terminal device that uses Java programming, in a video conferencing environment; col. 3, lines 29-35.

F) Carlson Teaches design & configuring Java Classes, see Para [0002,0025-0030, 0034-0040].

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(571) 273-7290 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reuben M. Brown whose telephone number is (571) 272-7290. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(8:30-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Chris Kelley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623